

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

NICOLE CHRISTINE TANGUAY,	Case No. 2:18-cv-01867-GMN-VCF
Petitioner,	ORDER
v.	
STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,	
Respondents.	

Nevada state prisoner petitioner Nicole Christine Tanguay has filed a *pro se* habeas corpus petition challenging the computation of her sentence (ECF No. 1). The petition is dismissed as noncognizable on federal habeas review.

Tanguay argues that the Nevada Department of Corrections has improperly failed to deduct statutory credits earned under NRS 209.4465 in violation of her federal due process rights. A state prisoner is entitled to federal habeas relief only if he is being held in custody in violation of the constitution, laws or treaties of the United States. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a). Unless an issue of federal constitutional or statutory law is implicated by the facts presented, the claim is not cognizable under federal habeas corpus. *Estelle v. McGuire*, 502 U.S. 62, 68 (1991). A petitioner may not transform a state-law issue into a federal one merely by asserting a violation of due process. *Langford v. Day*, 110 F.3d 1380, 1381 (9th Cir. 1996). Alleged errors in the interpretation or application of state law do not warrant habeas relief. *Hubbart v. Knapp*, 379 F.3d 773, 779-80 (9th Cir. 2004). Tanguay presents a state-law issue that is not cognizable in *federal* habeas corpus. Thus, the petition is dismissed.

1 The court further notes that Tanguay indicates that she has not sought relief in  
2 state court. See NRS 34.724(2)(c) (under Nevada law, a state postconviction petition  
3 for a writ of habeas corpus is "the only remedy available to an incarcerated person to  
4 challenge the computation of time that the person has served pursuant to a judgment of  
5 conviction").

6 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the petition is **DISMISSED** as set forth in this  
7 order.

8 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**.

9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk **SHALL SEND** to petitioner one copy  
10 of her filing in this case.

11 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly and  
12 close this case.

13  
14 DATED: 19 October 2018.

15  
16   
17 GLORIA M. NAVARRO, CHIEF JUDGE,  
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28